

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 14 are in the application. Claims 1, 5, 10, and 13 are currently amended; claims 2 – 4, 6 – 9, 11, 12, and 14 remain unchanged from the original versions thereof; and claim 15 is canceled. Claims 1, 5, 10, and 13 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added to the application as a result of the present Response.

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 – 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ryan et al. U.S. Publication No. 2004/0215793. This rejection is traversed.

The pending Office Action maintains the rejection of claims 1 – 14 based on the alleged disclosure of Ryan. The Final Office Action (hereinafter, FOA) states that Ryan discloses outputting an indication of one or more disconnects between the identified person and the one or more other persons wherein the disconnect indicates a separation in time regarding the link associating the identified person with the one or more other persons. In particular, the FOA states that paragraph [0106] of Ryan discloses the “dotted line shows time separation between individuals, in other words, the user and the other persons did not speak in a long time or never spoke, wherein those actions are associated with time separation.” The FOA also states at page 6, “[A]ny type of disconnection is associated with time”.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the FOA’s characterization of Ryan and reiterates that Ryan discloses, as a matter of fact,

[0102] According to a further aspect of the present invention, there is provided a means of visually displaying the interconnections between the nodes.

[0103] Preferably, a user's unique, private personal network may be visually represented on an electronic display in one or more of the following forms, including:

[0104] graphical, alphanumeric and/or animated symbols representing nodes joined by lines, or some form of visual link representing the connections between the nodes;

[0105] a solid line indicating entities who have joined or have consented to join the user's unique, private personal network;

[0106] dotted lines indicating entities who have been invited but they have not joined the user's unique, private personal network; (emphasis added)

Therefore, it is clear that Ryan discloses (including the specific portions cited and relied upon by the Office) visually displaying *interconnects* by dotted lines indicating entities who have been invited but they have not joined the user's unique, private personal network. That is, Ryan's dotted lines specifically refer to "interconnects" and not the claimed disconnects. Further, Ryan specifically and explicitly defines the dotted interconnect lines as being "dotted lines indicating entities who have been invited but they have not joined the user's unique, private personal network". Again, Ryan discloses "if two nodes exist independently in the database system or a unique, private personal network with no intermediate nodes connecting, they are said to be "disconnected" (Ryan, paragraph 72) there is no disclosure or even a suggestion that the mentioned "disconnects" are visually indicated by a dotted line.

Applicant's position and belief that Ryan's dotted lines do not indicate the claimed disconnect "wherein the disconnect indicates a separation in time regarding the link associating the identified person with the one or more other persons" is fully supported by Ryan's unambiguous statement that the dotted lines indicate entities who have been invited but they have not joined the user's unique, private personal network. Ryan's dotted lines are specifically defined as indicating entities who have been invited but they have not joined the user's unique, private personal network, not the claimed indication of a separation in time regarding the link associating the identified person with the one or more other persons. Ryan specifically discloses the dotted lines indicate a

specific action between the entities (i.e., entities who have been invited but they have not joined the user's unique, private personal network).

Ryan does not disclose or suggest any time limitation or consideration regarding the "dotted lines indicating entities who have been invited but they have not joined the user's unique, private personal network". Ryan specifically and only (i.e., merely) states that the entities visually linked by a dotted have not joined, without reference to or dependence on a time frame or separation in time.

The FOA's statement that "[A]ny type of disconnection is associated with time" does not appear to have support in the cited Ryan reference. Nor does the FOA provide any other source to support this statement (e.g., Official Notice, etc.) Applicant does not agree with or concede this statement is true. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to substantiate this statement that is relied upon in forming the basis and/or arguments for the rejection.

Furthermore, the statements in the Advisory Action that "the time between the moment the invitation was issued to the when the individual replys [sic] to the invitation is considered time separation. Consequently, the examiner maintains that the prior art teaches 'indication of one or more disconnects... wherein the disconnect indicates a separation in time' " are also not supported by the cited and relied upon Ryan. First, the Examiner proposes a definition for "time of separation" not supported or disclosed by Ryan and only introduced into the discussion by the Examiner. That is, the Examiner introduces the concept of a delayed reply being indicated by the Ryan dotted line even though Ryan specifically and explicitly defines the meaning of the dotted line therein. Applicant notes that the Examiner attempts to define "time of separation" claimed time of separation is fully supported by the Specification and extrinsic sources need not be consulted.

Additionally, the Office's reasoning and arguments teach away from or against that which is specifically disclosed by Ryan. Again, Ryan specifically discloses, "dotted

lines indicating entities who have been invited but they have not joined the user's unique, private personal network", without any reference to or association with time.

Applicant also submits that the issue regarding the rejection is what is *claimed* and what is disclosed by Ryan to justify the rejection under 35 USC 102(e). Accordingly, since Applicant claims "outputting an indication of the link associating the identified person with the one or more other persons and an indication of one or more disconnects between the identified person and the one or more other persons, wherein the disconnect indicates a separation in time regarding the link associating the identified person with the one or more other persons", Ryan needs to disclose the same to be a proper rejection under 35 USC 102(e). As shown above, Ryan instead discloses *dotted lines indicating entities who have been invited but they have not joined the user's unique, private personal network.* Clearly, Ryan does not disclose that which it must disclose to anticipate the claims under 35 USC 102(e).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Ryan fails to anticipate independent claims 1, 5, 10, and 13 under 35 USC 102(e) since Ryan does not disclose each and every claimed aspect as configured in the claims, as is required for sustaining a rejection under 35 USC 102(e). Claims 2 – 4, 6 – 9, 11, 12, and 14 depend from claims 1, 5, 10, and 13. Therefore, Applicant submits that all of claims 1 – 14 are patentable over Ryan under 35 USC 102(e).

Applicant thus requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 14, as well as the allowance of same.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-5985.

Respectfully submitted,

July 17, 2008
Date

/Randolph P. Calhoun/
Randolph P. Calhoun
Registration No. 45,371
BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF & TALWALKAR LLC
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-5985